

REMARKS

This is intended to be a complete response to the Official Action mailed October 11, 2006, in which claims 1-27 were rejected. Pending claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to indicate that the majority of the Co in the catalyst occurs as CoMoO_4 , thereby rendering the claims definite. This is supported in the specification for example in paragraph 0053, lines 7-9, and paragraph 0056, and Fig. 4.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112¶2.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §103(a)

Claims 7, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over WO 00/26138, in view of Chattopadhyay article.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the basis that the rejected claims (7, 14 and 21) are directed not just to single-walled carbon nanotubes alone, but to an "as-produced" carbon nanotube product comprising

both the single walled carbon nanotubes and the catalyst upon which they are produced and still associated with (i.e., unseparated), wherein the carbon nanotube product is produced by the methods of claim 1, 8 and 15, respectively.

The '138 reference broadly teaches use of a catalyst comprising a mixture of Group VI and Group VIII transition metals. However, the catalyst used in the '138 reference is provided in a gaseous form (see p. 8, lines 18-20, for example), not in a solid form on a support material. In particular, reference '138 does not specifically teach use of a catalyst comprising Co in a CoMoO_4 form and Mo in oxide clusters dispersed upon a support material. Thus the carbon product of reference '138 could not be a catalyst-nanotube mixture comprising CoMo on a support material with the single-walled carbon nanotubes still associated therewith.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §103(a).

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §103(a)

Claims 7, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bandow et al., article.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the same reason provided in the response to the rejection of the claims 7, 14 and 21 over the


'138 reference above. Bandow et al., teach purified single walled carbon nanotubes, but do not teach a carbon nanotube product comprising single walled carbon nanotubes still associated with a catalyst comprising Co and Mo on a support material, as produced using the method of claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively. That is, the carbon product of claims 7, 14 and 21 comprises nanotubes which are not separated from the CoMo catalyst which comprises a support material.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the refection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit the claims are now in a condition for allowance and request issuance of a Notice of Allowance thereof.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher W. Corbett

Reg. No. 36,109

DUNLAP CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.

P.O. Box 16370

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73113

Telephone: 405/607-8600

Facsimile: 405/607-8686

Agent for Applicants